Approved For Release 2005/11/29 : CIA-RDP79R00904A001000020007-4

5 December 1963

HEMORANDUM FOR: The Deputy Director of Central Intelligence
SUBJECT: Institute of Strategic Studies

- 1. The Institute of Strategic Studies is the only British organisation devoted to stimulating research and discussion on the kind of politico-military subjects treated in this country by government-supported organizations like RAND and IDA and the various university research centers where men like Kissinger, Schalling, Knorr, etc., are to be found. It is a private institution set up with a Ford Foundation grant in 1958 (\$50,000 a year for three years) and is now trying to become self-supporting through contributions from private industry. However, it has an impressive membership of retired military notables, MP's, professors, and journalists, and is well-connected with students of military affairs, official and unofficial, in the US and on the Continent.
- 2. A recent PEE-spensored conference on NATO matters had Down Acheson, Defense Minister Thorseyereft, and Fritz Erler of the German SPD mong its speakers; in addition to a host of

American academic participants there were two US government participants at the deputy assistant secretary level, Harry Rosen of Defense and Bob Schnetzel of State. The Director of IRS is Alistair Buchen, a former assistant editor of the Rosensist who later handled successively the Washington, diplomatic, and defense assignments for the Cheever.

3. Although the ISS is a private organization whose publications have not hesitated to criticize British defense policy, its obvious connections with the Establishment appears to pose somewhat of a dilemma for Whitehell, which would obviously prefer to disassociate itself from the ISS completely but is fearful that erromeous statements by the latter may nonetheless be taken as anthoritative and thus mislead the public. This has been particularly true of the ensual compendium on The Military Balance, of which the present 1963-64 edition is the fifth. The

25X1

- 2 -

TOP SECRET

25X1

5. There is attached a copy of the most recent ISS yearly study, procured for us in London. Immediately following is a statement comparing ISS figures on the main Soviet weapons categories with existing NIE figures.

SHEWAN KENT Assistant Director National Estimates

TOP SECRET

ATTACHEST

SUBJECT: Comparison of ISS Study, The Military Balance, 1963-1964, with Current Estimates

- Helence, 1963-1964, contains estimates which are generally consistent with those held in current NIE's. The order-of-battle estimates for the Communist Bloc differ in detail from our own but estimates of the Soviet forces are in most cases not significantly different. The ISS study does not present detailed technical characteristics for weapon systems which are susceptible to comparison with the NIE's. We have therefore limited our comparisons to numerical estimates on the Soviet armed forces. In the examples which follow, the ISS figures are for October 1963; the NIE figures are for the same period unless otherwise noted.
- 2. The estimates on Soviet military expenditures and manpower are fairly close. The ISS study estimates military
 expenditures in 1963 of 15.4 billion rubbes with a dollar
 equivalent of \$34 billion. Comparable 1962 figures from

Approved For Release 2005/11/29: CIA-RDP79R00904A001000020007-4

TOP SECRET

NIE 11-4 are 16 billion rubles and \$45 billion, and our estimates for 1963 will probably be slightly higher. However, our figures include expenditures for military R and D and space, and the IDE figures do not; this probably accounts for most of the apparent difference. Estimated personnel strength is almost identical:

3.3 million men in the IBS study and 3.325 million in HIE 11-4.

Our estimate was for December 1962; we doubt that substantial changes have occurred since then. IBS holds that Soviet forces have been reduced by some 300,000 men in the past year, but this probably reflects a lag in information. The IBS breakdown of personnel strength by force component is less detailed than that in HIE 11-4, but it appears to be comparable.

3. Most of the ISS figures on long-range strike forces are elso close to our recent estimates. ISS estimates: 100 ICEM's vs. 105-120; 750 MISM's vs. 690-735 MREM's/IMEM's; 190 heavy bumbers vs. 180-205; and 1,000 medium bumbers vs. 940-975. In this category the major difference lies in subscrine-launched ballistic missiles. ISS estimates about 30 ballistic missile subscrines carrying a total of 90 SEEM's; we estimate about 50 such

- 2 -

Approved For Release 2005/11/29: CIA-RDP79R00904A001000020007-4

TOP SECRET

submarines carrying a total of 140-155 missiles. ISS refers to a 100 n.m. submarine-launched cruise missile (we estimate a 300 n.m. range), but does not estimate numbers or types of cruise-missile submarines. Moreover, ISS does not appear to be aware that the Soviets have nuclear-powered missile submarines operational.

4. Some differences exist between ISS estimates of theater field forces and those held in ourrent RIE's. ISS estimates 150 line divisions (75 combat ready) vs. our December 1962 estimate of 145 line divisions (72 combat ready). ISS also estimates a greater mobilization and reinforcement capability than we do. Again, the higher ISS figures may reflect a lag in information; we would estimate somewhat fewer divisions at present. Aside from the missile submarine estimates noted above, no major differences are apparent in estimates of naval forces. The ISS study is probably weakest in its appraisal of Soviet air defense forces. Numbers are given only for fighters, the estimated composition of the fighter force is vey off, the technical

characteristics given for SAM's are incomplete and wrong, and no mention is made of ABM deployment.

Conclusion

5. Although most of the figures in the ISS study are close
to those carried in current NIE's (and some are identical), we
loubt that its authors had direct access to our estimates. The
operant gaps and legs in information render this highly
improbable.

25X1

25X1

_ 1. _